

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

AUGUSTA DIVISION

DOUGLAS ROLAND DIXON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CV 115-145
)	
JEFFERSON COUNTY LAW)	
ENFORCEMENT CENTER, and Others;)	
GARY HUTCHENSON, Sheriff of Jefferson)	
County, Georgia,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at Rogers State Prison in Reidsville, Georgia, commenced the above-captioned case pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 concerning events at the Jefferson County Jail. Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). Due to various deficiencies in Plaintiff’s complaint, the Court ordered him to amend his complaint on February 25, 2016. (Doc. no. 8.) Plaintiff was given twenty-one days to comply, and he was warned that, if he wanted to proceed with his case, he must file an amended complaint. (See *id.*) In addition, the Court specifically advised Plaintiff that if he failed to amend his complaint as instructed, the Court would presume that he desired to have his case voluntarily dismissed and would recommend dismissal of his case without prejudice. (*Id.* at 4.) Plaintiff has failed to respond to the Court’s February 25th Order.

The Eleventh Circuit has stated that “[a] district court has inherent authority to manage its own docket ‘so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.’” Equity Lifestyle Props., Inc. v. Fla. Mowing & Landscape Serv., Inc., 556 F.3d 1232, 1240 (11th Cir. 2009) (quoting Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 43 (1991)). This authority includes the power to dismiss a case for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with a court order, which operates as an adjudication on the merits unless the Court specifies otherwise. See Id. (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)); see also Hyler v. Reynolds Metal Co., 434 F.2d 1064, 1065 (5th Cir. 1970)¹ (“It is well settled that a district court has inherent power to dismiss a case for failure to prosecute”). Moreover, the Local Rules of the Southern District of Georgia dictate that an “assigned Judge may, after notice to counsel of record, *sua sponte* . . . dismiss any action for want of prosecution, with or without prejudice . . . [for] failure to prosecute a civil action with reasonable promptness.” Loc. R. 41.1(c). Finally, “dismissal without prejudice [is] appropriate” pursuant to Rule 41(b) where a plaintiff has failed to comply with a court order, “especially where the litigant has been forewarned.” Owens v. Pinellas Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t, 331 F. App’x 654, 655 (11th Cir. 2009) (citing Moon v. Newsome, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989)).

Here, the Court clearly ordered Plaintiff to amend his complaint within twenty-one days of its February 25, 2016 Order, and it warned Plaintiff that, in the event he failed to do so, his case would be dismissed without prejudice. (See doc. no.8, p. 4.) Plaintiff’s failure to


¹ In Bonner v. City of Prichard, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 1981) (*en banc*), the Eleventh Circuit adopted as binding precedent all decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to October 1, 1981.

comply or even to provide the Court with an explanation for his failure to amend his complaint amounts not only to a failure to prosecute, but also an abandonment of his case. Furthermore, because Plaintiff is proceeding IFP, the Court finds that the imposition of monetary sanctions is not a feasible sanction.

The Court recognizes that Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and acknowledges that courts have voiced a dislike for the harshness of dismissing a *pro se* case with prejudice prior to an adjudication on the merits. See, e.g., Minnette v. Time Warner, 997 F.2d 1023, 1027 (2d Cir. 1993); Dickson v. Ga. State Bd. of Pardons & Paroles, No. 1:06-CV-1310-JTC, 2007 WL 2904168, at *6 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 3, 2007). Thus, the Court is not persuaded that it would be appropriate to dismiss the instant action with prejudice. The Court is not permanently barring Plaintiff from bringing a meritorious claim. It is simply recommending dismissing the case without prejudice until such time as Plaintiff is willing to file his case and pursue it.

For the reasons set forth herein, the Court **REPORTS** and **RECOMMENDS** that this case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice under Loc. R. 41.1 for want of prosecution and that this civil action be **CLOSED**.

SO REPORTED and RECOMMENDED this 28th day of March, 2016, at Augusta, Georgia.



BRIAN K. EPPS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA